

創価大学  
国際仏教学高等研究所  
年報

平成13年度  
(第5号)

Annual Report  
of  
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology  
at Soka University

for the Academic Year 2001

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所  
東京・2002・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology  
Soka University  
Tokyo・2002

# Some Remarks on the “*Petaka* Passages” in the *Da zhidu lun* and their Relation to the Pāli *Petakopadesa*\*<sup>1</sup>

Stefano Zacchetti

## 1. Introduction

Recently, the identification of an early partial Chinese translation of the Pāli treatise named *Petakopadesa*<sup>1</sup> led me into a reconsideration of the three well known passages of the *Da zhidu lun* 大智度論 T 1509 (hereafter DZDL)<sup>2</sup> which deal with a text – \**Petaka* by name (see below n. 6-7) – ascribed to the Buddha’s disciple Mahākātyāyana.

The possibility that this scripture may, at least in part, correspond to the Pāli *Petakopadesa*, transmitted under the name of the same author (Mahākaccāna), has been suggested several times by modern scholars<sup>3</sup>. However, to my knowledge, a detailed demonstration of the correspondence between the \**Petaka* described by the DZDL and its Pāli counterparts was never provided, in spite of the fact that the Chinese source contains, as I will show, a number of significant parallels and even literal quotations which can be traced to the *Petakopadesa*.

In the following parts I will analyse the three “*Petaka* passages”, listed according to their relevance. I hope to show that they constitute a significant

---

\* I am grateful to my senior colleagues Prof. Hiroshi Kanno and Prof. Seishi Karashima for a number of important suggestions on some points discussed in this article.

<sup>1</sup> I have identified the *Yin chi ru jing* 陰持入經 T 603, translated into Chinese by An Shigao 安世高 around the half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD, as a version of what is nowadays chapter 6 of the *Petakopadesa*: i.e. the *Suttatthasamuccayabhūmi*; on this finding see Zacchetti, forthcoming.

<sup>2</sup> This is the fundamental commentary on the *Pañcaviniśatisahasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* translated into Chinese by Kumārajīva at the beginning of the 5<sup>th</sup> century and traditionally ascribed to Nāgārjuna.

<sup>3</sup> Notably by Wogihara (1911, rep. p. 210), possibly for the first time, and subsequently by Mizuno in his fundamental article on the *Petakopadesa* (1997; for the DZDL passages see pp. 128-129, probably the most detailed treatment of this question), Lamotte (1944 n. 2 p. 109), Saigusa 1969 n. 42 p. 131 and Yinshun 1990 p. 42 (but with some important differences: see below n. 86). Venkata Ramanan (1966 p. 141-ff. and n. 29 pp. 357b – 358a) has followed a completely different track: while taking note of Lamotte’s explanation of the term \**Pi le* (on the whole the correct one), for some reasons he interpreted it as equivalent to *Vinaya*.

source for the study of an important tradition whose history remains, on the whole, regrettably obscure<sup>4</sup>.

On the other hand, they may also contribute to enrich the widely shared image of the DZDL as a merely “Sarvāstivādin turned Mādhyamika” work: this most important commentary is certainly a more complex text<sup>5</sup>.

## 2. *Pile* and *Petakopadesa*

### 2.1

In Chapter XXX of the DZDL (which in the *Taishō* edition is included in the 18<sup>th</sup> *juan* 卷), at a point of a long section devoted to various forms of *prajñā*, a threefold classification of the Teachings on the *Dharma* (法門) is introduced: as Teachings of the \**Pile*<sup>6</sup> (\**Petaka*)<sup>7</sup> \*毘勒門, of the *Abhidharma* 阿毘曇門, and of Emptiness 空門<sup>8</sup>.

The first one, the Teaching of the \**Petaka* (\*毘勒門)<sup>9</sup>, is ascribed to Mahākātyāyana 大迦栴延. It is said to consist of 384.000 “words”<sup>10</sup>, yet

<sup>4</sup> Apart from the DZDL, to my knowledge in the Chinese Canon there are only two other scriptures containing quotations relevant to the *Petakopadesa*: Vasuvarman's *Si di lun* 四諦論 T 1647 (see Demiéville, *Sources Chinoises*, in Demiéville 1973 p. 453; Nakamura 1980 p. 113 and n. 102), and the *Jietuo dao lun* 解脫道論 T 1648 (\**Vimuttimagga* / *Vimuktimārga*: see Demiéville loc. cit., Mizuno 1954, p. 17). For a detailed analysis of these quotations see Mizuno 1997, pp. 129-140.

<sup>5</sup> This is also one of the main points in Ven. Yinshun's study on the DZDL (1990).

<sup>6</sup> In his translation of the DZDL, Lamotte (1944 p. 113, corresponding to DZDL p. 70a 21, and *passim*) – possibly following Przyluski 1926 p. 73 – referred to this “Teaching” as “*Pi le*”, without further comment. However, it must be clear that this is a conjecture (probably he read \*毘勒), though a very easy one: as a matter of fact all the available witnesses of the DZDL I could access read *kun le* 蠕 / 毘勒 in all the relevant passages. On this issue see the Appendix (4) below.

<sup>7</sup> Lamotte 1949 pp. 1074-ff. and Lamotte 1944 p. 114 give *Pitaka* as an equivalent for \**Pile*, while Lamotte 1944 p. 113 (and 1958 p. 208) has *Petaka*. I prefer the latter form, which is corroborated by a number of quotations in Pāli exegetical literature (see Nāṇamoli 1964 pp. 399-401). See also Saigusa 1969 n. 42 p. 131.

<sup>8</sup> Incidentally, this portion of the DZDL, especially the passage quoted below in n. 73 (T 1509 p. 194a 28 – b 1), exerted some influence on those schools of Chinese Buddhism more or less directly connected with the Mādhyamika tradition introduced by Kumārajīva: e.g. see Jizang 吉藏, *Sanlun xuan yi* 三論玄義 T 1852 p. 4c 16-ff. and *Weimojing yishu* 維摩經義疏 T 1781, p. 943a 17-ff.; Zhanran 湛然, *Weimojing lueshu* 維摩經略疏 T 1778 p. 625c 23 – 626a 15; Zhiyi 智顥, *Mohe zhi guan* 摩訶止觀 T 1911 p. 73b 25-ff. (esp. 73c 24-ff.) and *Si jiao yi* 四教義 T 1929 p. 731b 16 and T 1929 p. 731b 16 and *passim*. I am grateful to Prof. Kanno for some references on this topic. On the whole, all these texts seem to have drawn their information on the \**Petaka* only from Chinese sources: i.e. mainly the DZDL and a few glosses on Mahākātyāyana by Kumārajīva, Sengzhao 僧肇 and Daosheng 道生 preserved in the *Zhu Weimojie jing* 注維摩詰經 T 1775 (e.g. p. 353b 3 – ff. etc.). As a possible exception, I must mention a passage of Jizang's *Bailun shu* 百論疏 T 1827 p. 299a 19-20, which requires further investigation (it might be based on Paramārtha's commentary to Vasumitra's treatise on the Buddhist sects: Demiéville 1931-1932 pp. 49-50; cf. Yinshun 1990 p. 42).

<sup>9</sup> T 1509 p. 192b 3 – c 8; tr. Lamotte 1949 pp. 1074-1077.

<sup>10</sup> *Yan* 言, i.e. *akṣaras*, syllables: see Demiéville 1950, p. 388 and n. 1; see also Boucher 2000 pp. 22-23. This figure would give a total of 12000 *ślokas* for the \**Petaka*; cf. Jizang's *Weimojing yishu* T 1781 p. 943a 17, where a similar computation is made, though on the basis of the figure provided by the DZDL at p. 70b 10 (cf. below n. 59 and 64). Perhaps this record should not be dismissed

supposedly being the summary of a much larger original text (3.200.000 “words”) composed during the Buddha’s life: this was later abridged and written down by some “enlightened persons” because, after the Buddha’s *parinirvāṇa*, the life-span and strength of memory of the human beings decreased, so that they were not able to recite this scripture in full<sup>11</sup>.

The *\*Petaka*, which is portrayed in a slightly unsympathetic light<sup>12</sup>, consists of several methods (種種諸門), two of which are expounded as examples: the “Method based on the characteristics” (隨相門), and the “Method by antidote” (對治門). This is by far the most interesting portion of the whole passage, as these two methods can be in part traced to the Pāli *Petakopadesa*<sup>13</sup> or to the *Nettippakarana* (hereafter *Netti*)<sup>14</sup>.

### 2.1.1

Chapter five of the *Petakopadesa*<sup>15</sup> is devoted to the exposition of sixteen categories (*hāra*, “Modes of Conveying [a communication]”, as Nāṇamoli renders it)<sup>16</sup> of the greatest importance to its system. As a matter of fact, the fifth category, “Characteristic” (*lakkhaṇo hāro*, hereafter *lakkhaṇa-h.*)<sup>17</sup>, is nothing but the first method mentioned in the DZDL, “based on the characteristics”<sup>18</sup>.

---

straight away: as, I hope, will appear clear from the present article, the exposition of the *\*Petaka* provided in this portion of the DZDL was, at least in part, based on the original source: its author may indeed have seen the *\*Petaka*. On the other hand, the other figure given here (三百二十萬言) is very likely mythical, just as, in general, the context within which it occurs.

<sup>11</sup> DZDL T 1509 p. 192b 4-6: 佛滅度後，人壽轉減，憶識力少，不能廣誦，諸得道人撰爲三十八萬四千言。In this context, where it is contrasted to the preceding 誦, “to recite, to psalmodize” (on this term, see the remarks by Lévi 1915, pp. 426-428), the verb 撰 (Lamotte 1949 p. 1074: “composèrent”) must, more specifically, mean “to write” (see HYDCD vol. 6 p. 893a, 5). The fact that not only abridgement, but writing down is referred to is quite interesting. This phrase seems to echo a common motif: cf. the account of the writing down of the Pāli Canon analysed by Bechert 1992 p. 51, and especially the passage quoted in n. 21 (from the *Mahāvāṇsaṭīkā*), which comes surprisingly close to the DZDL’s description. Although in translating 憶識 simply as “memory” (cf. Lamotte, loc. cit.: “la force des intelligences”) I have followed HYDCD vol. 7 p. 766a, I cannot help observing that 憶識力少 might reflect an original reading similar to that quoted by Bechert: *satibuddhiparihāṇi* ... . On the other hand, elsewhere the DZDL itself makes use of the same cliché to describe the abridgement of the *Prajñāpāramitā* literature: see Hikata 1958 p. LVIII.

<sup>12</sup> DZDL T 1509 p. 192b 6: 若人入\*毘勒門，論議則無窮；i.e. «If one enters into the [teaching of the] *\*Petaka*, gets entangled in endless discussions».

<sup>13</sup> Prof. Mizuno (1997 p. 129) has suggested, but only in general terms, that the 隨相門 may refer to the sixteen *hāras*.

<sup>14</sup> This is another Pāli treatise attributed to Mahākaccāna (see von Hintüber 1996 pp. 77-80, §§ 158-166; Norman 1983 pp. 109-110; Bond 1996b); it shares many of the features and topics found in the *Petakopadesa*. On the problematic relationship between the two, see the Conclusions (3) below.

<sup>15</sup> *Petakopadesa* pp. 81-111; tr. Nāṇamoli 1964 pp. 105-154; summary in Bond 1996a pp. 388-393.

<sup>16</sup> On this pivotal technical term occurring in both the *Petakopadesa* and *Netti*, see Nāṇamoli 1962 pp. xxxv-xxxvi.

<sup>17</sup> *Petakopadesa* p. 90, 15 – 91, 15; tr. Nāṇamoli 1964 pp. 120-121.

<sup>18</sup> My translation of 隨相門 is tentative, and mainly based on its correspondence with the Pāli. Lamotte (1949 p. 1075) has interpreted it as “enseignement par implication (*anuvartana*)”.

### 2.1.2

The correspondence between the two sources is remarkably precise, even in the form of the exposition<sup>19</sup>. According to the *Petakopadesa*, the main content of this category is that "... When one idea is mentioned, all / Ideas of like characteristic / Are by that mentioned ..." (tr. Nāṇamoli 1964 p. 120)<sup>20</sup>. This principle is then made clear by means of some examples, the second of which is of particular interest: in the stanza "... Purifying one's mind: this is the teaching of the Buddhas" also the mental factors concomitant with *citta* are implied<sup>21</sup>.

The very same example and a similar explanation also occur in the DZDL's exposition of the "Method based on the characteristics" 隨相門 (I have underlined the literal correspondences between the two texts)<sup>22</sup>:

DZDL T 1509 p. 192b 9-10:

*Petakopadesa* p. 91, 3-4:

諸惡莫作 諸善奉行

(cf. *Petakopadesa* p. 54, 5-6:

*Sabbapāpassa akaraṇam kusalassa  
upasampada*<sup>23</sup>

自淨其意 是諸佛教。

*sacittapariyodapanam etam Buddhāna  
sāsanāti gāthā*

是中心數法盡應說。今但說自淨其意，則  
知

諸心數法已說。

*cetasikā dhammā vuttā*

何以故？同相同緣故。

DZDL:

«*Not doing any evil,  
practising all good,  
purifying one's own mind:  
This is the Buddhas' Teaching.*

Here all the mental factors should have been mentioned. Now, if [this stanza] only reads: *purifying one own mind*, then one must know that [also] the mental factors are hereby referred to. Why? Because they have the same characteristic and object [as *citta*]<sup>24</sup>.

<sup>19</sup> Both sources provide several examples, by first quoting a stanza (although in the *Petakopadesa*'s *lakkhana-h*. all the quotations are shortened), and then commenting on it. For a more detailed analysis of these features see part 3.1 below.

<sup>20</sup> *Petakopadesa* p. 90, 16-17: *Vuttamhi ekadhamme ye dhammā ekaṭakkaṇā / tena sabbe  
bhavanti vuttā*.

<sup>21</sup> The *Petakopadesa* further links these to other categories, ultimately referring this passage to the scheme of the four Noble Truths. This is a typical hermeneutical pattern in the *Petakopadesa*.

<sup>22</sup> Tr. Lamotte 1949 p. 1075.

<sup>23</sup> As observed by Lamotte (1949 n. 1 p. 1075), the stanza quoted by the DZDL corresponds to *Dhammapada* v. 183; this is quoted in full in this other passage of the *Petakopadesa*, where it occurs in a different context, as well as in four passages of the *Netti* (see the list in Nāṇamoli 1962 p. 283, under the heading "Dh verse 183"). Significantly, only in this occurrence within the *lakkhana-h*. of the *Petakopadesa*, the interpretation of this stanza matches, at least in part, that of the DZDL.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. the exposition of the *lakkhana-hāra* in the *Netti*, where an similar formula occurs quite often; e.g. p. 31, 8-9: *kena kāraṇena? Ekaṭakkaṇattā ... etc. (and passim)*. As to 緣, I have

### 2.1.3

As a second example, the DZDL (T 1509 p. 192b 12-17) mentions the four foundations of mindfulness (四念處). This comes close, to a certain extent, to the first example given by the *Peṭakopadesa* in the section on the *lakkhaṇa-h*. (also on the *satipaṭṭhānas*), though we find some discrepancies. The *Peṭakopadesa* (p. 90, 18-25) states that when one mentions the *kāya*, all other *satipaṭṭhānas* are hereby implied<sup>25</sup>, while in the DZDL (T 1509 p. 192b 12-17) the *satipaṭṭhānas* are said to imply other categories belonging to the *bodhipakkhiyā* group:

«For instance, when the Buddha [only] refers to the four foundations of mindfulness, in the latter [also] the four right endeavours, the four bases of supernatural power, the five faculties and the five forces are included»<sup>26</sup>.

Interestingly enough, in this case the closest parallel to the DZDL's exposition is to be found not in the *Peṭakopadesa*, but in the corresponding portion of the *Netti (lakkhaṇa-hāra)*<sup>27</sup>:

«When the four Foundations of Mindfulness are kept in being the four Right Endeavours come to fulfilment through keeping in being. When the four Right Endeavours are kept in being the four Bases for Success ... come to fulfilment through keeping in being. When the four Bases for Success are kept in being the five Faculties ... come to fulfilment through keeping in being. When the five Faculties are kept in being the five Powers come to fulfilment through keeping in being. Etc. <sup>28</sup> ...»<sup>29</sup>.

The DZDL is more explicit in stating that the foundations of mindfulness involve (是中 etc.) the four right endeavours etc.; but the participial form used in the *Netti* parallel (*catūsu ... bhāviyamānesu*) seems to imply substantially the same meaning: i.e. that these attainments are not conceived as a sequence of stages reached one after the other.

The DZDL goes on explaining:

---

followed Lamotte's interpretation (1949 p. 1075: *ālambana*); cf. also DZDL T 1509 p. 296c 12-14 (tr. Lamotte 1980 p. 2174).

<sup>25</sup> If I understand correctly Nāṇamoli 1964 p. 120 n. 322/3, the 20<sup>th</sup>-century commentary *Peṭakopadesa-Āṭṭhakathā* (Cy) has (in the lemma?) ... *sabba-bodhipakkhiyadhammā* [vuttā bhavanti] instead of the reading *sabbadhammā* etc. of *Peṭakopadesa* p. 91, 1. As Nāṇamoli seems to imply, this is merely due to the influence of the parallel in the *Netti* (see below, n. 29), and not a genuine variant reading (see also Nāṇamoli 1964 pp. xiii-xiv). I am not in the position to express an opinion on this point, as, unfortunately, I could not get a copy of this Commentary. However the issue is worth reconsidering, given that this reading occurring in Cy would agree well with the passage from the \**Peṭaka* I am dealing with here (see the text quoted in the next note; cf. also below n. 37: *maggio*).

<sup>26</sup> T 1509 p. 192b 12-14: 如佛說四念處，是中不離四正慤、四如意足、五根、五力。

<sup>27</sup> On this topic, see Satō 1966, esp. p. 207 on this example concerning the *bodhipakkhiyā*.

<sup>28</sup> I have quoted Nāṇamoli's translation (1962 p. 52 § 175). In the *Netti* all the *bodhipakkhiyā* are linked together in this way. However, cf. the occurrence of the same exegesis at *Netti* 83, 8-12 where, by a curious coincidence (?), only those *bodhipakkhiyā* referred to by the DZDL are mentioned. Nevertheless, all the categories are meant here (83, 12: *evam sabbe*); I suspect that the same holds true for the DZDL's parallel.

<sup>29</sup> *Netti* p. 31, 10-16: *Catūsu satipaṭṭhānesu bhāviyamānesu cattāro sammappadhānā bhāvanāpāripūriṇ gacchanti. Catūsu sammappadhānesu bhāviyamānesu cattāro iddhippādā bhāvanāpāripūriṇ gacchanti. Catūsu iddhippādesu bhāviyamānesu pañcindriyāni bhāvanāpāripūriṇ gacchanti. Pañcasu indriyesu bhāviyamānesu pañca balāni bhāvanāpāripūriṇ gacchanti etc. ...*

«Why? [Because] In the four foundations of mindfulness the four kinds of energy (精進, \*virya) constitute the four right endeavours; the four kinds of concentration (定, \*samādhi) constitute the four bases of supernatural power; the five kinds of positive *dharmas* constitute the five faculties and the five forces. Although the Buddha has merely referred to the four foundations of mindfulness, without mentioning other categories, one has to know that these are hereby implied»<sup>30</sup>.

A parallel to this elucidation can be found, again, in the *Netti*. Few lines before the passage quoted above, we find an interesting exegesis on the canonical *kāyasatipatṭhāna* formula (i.e. ... *bhikkhu kāye kāyānupassī viharati ātāpi sampajāno satimā vineyya loke abhijjhā-domanassam*)<sup>31</sup>:

«“Ardent” means the faculty of energy; “aware” means the faculty of wisdom; “mindful” means the faculty of mindfulness; “overcoming both desire for and discontent with the world” means the faculty of concentration»<sup>32</sup>.

So, as we can see, also according to the *Netti* the *kāyasatipatṭhāna* formula involves, among other faculties, *viriyindriya* (corresponding to 四種精進) and *samādhindriya* (四種定). The fact that the DZDL mentions “four kinds” of energy and concentration can also be explained: in the *Vibhaṅga* (PTS ed. pp. 194-202), which displays a similar – though by far more detailed – interpretation of the *satipatṭhāna* formula, the presence of the various faculties involved is asserted four times, with regard to all the *satipatṭhānas*<sup>33</sup>. We may conjecture that the \**Petaka* quoted by the DZDL meant exactly the same by mentioning “four kinds” of energy etc.

The “five kinds of positive *dharmas*” (五種善法) further referred to by the DZDL must quite obviously be the positive qualities which constitute the content of the two fivefold groups of *bodhipakkhiyā*, i.e. faculties and forces: *saddhā*, *viriya*, *sati*, *samādhi*, and *paññā*<sup>34</sup>.

Although there are some discrepancies, the argument is largely similar in the DZDL and in the *Netti*: for both scriptures some faculties are implied by the *satipatṭhāna* formula, and this fact makes it possible to establish a connection between the four foundations of mindfulness and the other categories of *bodhipakkhiyā*<sup>35</sup>.

<sup>30</sup> DZDL T 1509 p. 192b 14-17: 何以故？四念處中，四種精進則是四正慤，四種定是爲四如意足，五種善法是爲五根五力。佛雖不說餘門，但說四念處，當知已說餘門。

<sup>31</sup> Gethin (1992 p. 29) translates: «... A bhikkhu ... with regards to the body dwells watching body; he is ardent, he comprehends clearly, is possessed of mindfulness and overcomes both desire for and discontent with the world».

<sup>32</sup> *Netti* p. 31, 3-5: Ātāpi ti viriyindriyā. Sampajāno ti paññindriyā. Satimā ti satindriyā. Vineyya loke abhijjhādomanassan ti samādhindriyā. See Gethin 1992 pp. 48-49 for important remarks on another occurrence of this passage (i.e. *Netti* p. 83, 1-3).

<sup>33</sup> Note that the *Vibhaṅga* does not gloss the phrase *Vineyya loke* etc. in terms of *samādhi*. Significantly, only the *Netti* does so.

<sup>34</sup> I could not find a clear parallel to this category of 五種善法 either in the *Netti* or in the *Vibhaṅga*.

<sup>35</sup> This connection is certainly more explicit in the DZDL than in the Pāli treatise. Actually, in the *Netti* (31, 6-9) at first the *kāyasatipatṭhāna* is linked to the other foundations of mindfulness (cf. *Petakopadesa* 90, 18-25 mentioned above); then the *satipatṭhānas* as a whole are in turn linked to other *bodhipakkhiyā* as in the DZDL. But it is indeed remarkable that even in the *Netti*, as in the DZDL, it is by means of the faculties (*indriya*) that such connections are established: see p.

## 2.1.4

The last example concerning the *lakkhaṇa-h.* provided by the DZDL (T 1509 p. 192b 17-22) deals with the Four Truths. This passage too has a parallel in the *Petakopadesa*, although not in the chapter on *hāras*<sup>36</sup> but in that devoted to the Noble Truths (ch. 1):

DZDL T 1509 p. 192b 17-22:

如佛於四諦中，或說一諦，或二或三。如  
馬星比丘爲舍利弗說偈：

諸法從緣生    是法緣及盡  
我師大聖王    是義如是說

此偈但說三諦，當知道諦已在中，不相離  
故。

譬如一人犯事，舉家受罪。

Petakopadesa p. 10, 22 – 11, 2:

*Tattha katamāni cattāri ariyasaccāni?*

*Ye dhammā hetuppbhavā tesam hetum*  
*Tatāgato āha, tesam ca yo nirodho*  
*evamvādi mahāsamano ti*  
*hetuppbhavā dhammā dukkham,*  
*hetu samudayo,*  
*yam Bhagavato vacanam ayam*  
*\*maggo<sup>37</sup>,*  
*so nirodho<sup>38</sup>.*

## DZDL:

«For instance, the Buddha sometimes [only] mentions one of the Four Truths, at other times two or three. Similarly, when the *bhikṣu* Aśvajit<sup>39</sup> uttered this *gāthā* for the benefit of Śāriputra:

*"All the dharmas arise from causal conditions;*  
*The causes and the cessation of these dharmas,*  
*My Master, the Great Saint King*  
*Thus has taught this Truth*

[Although] this *gāthā* only mentions three Truths, one must know that also the Truth of the Path is [implicitly] included in it, because [here the Truths] are not separated. So, for instance, when somebody commits a crime his whole family bears the responsibility for it<sup>40</sup>».

31, 8: *Kena kāraṇena? Ekalakkhaṇattā catunnaṃ indriyāṇaṃ*, and cf. the text quoted above, n. 30, although in the *Netti* this explanation is only referred to the *satipatthānas* (the connection of all the *bodhipakkhiya* is explained in different terms: see *Netti* p. 31, 22-23).

<sup>36</sup> However, a reference to the Truths within the *lakkhaṇa-h.* is also made by the *Petakopadesa* (91, 4-7, tr. Nāṇamoli p. 121): after the example quoted above on the *cetasikā, citta* is further connected with *rūpa*; both this terms, taken together as *nāmarūpa*, are then considered as equivalent to the Truth of suffering etc.

<sup>37</sup> See Nāṇamoli 1964 p. 14 n. 42/2: the reading *maggo* (for *dhammo*) occurs in the modern commentary (*Cy*: see above n. 25).

<sup>38</sup> Nāṇamoli 1964 p. 14 translates this short exegesis as follows: «[Now here] the “ideas that draw their being from a cause” are [A] *Suffering*, the cause is [B] *Origin*, the Blessed One’s statement [D] the *Path*, [and] that [statement is also] [C] *Cessation*». However, *so nirodho* is more likely to be a tautological reference to “*tesam ca yo nirodho*” in the stanza. On the other hand, *yam Bhagavato vacanam*, which is said to represent the Truth of the Path, may refer to “*Tatāgato āha*”.

<sup>39</sup> 馬星; see Lamotte 1949 n. 3 p. 630. Elsewhere in the DZDL (e.g. p. 136b 23) this name is rendered by means of phonetic transcription as *Ashuoshi* 阿說示. In mentioning Aśvajit and Śāriputra, the DZDL is very likely referring to a previous passage which has nothing to do with the \**Petaka*: see T 1509 p. 136c, tr. Lamotte 1949 p. 631.

<sup>40</sup> This last phrase (T 1509 p. 192b 22: 譬如一人犯事，舉家受罪) is perhaps an explanation added by Kumārajīva and not quoted from the \**Petaka*. The principle it describes seems foreign

Not only is the same stanza<sup>41</sup> quoted (possibly with some variants) in both sources, but it is also interpreted in a similar way, even if in the *Petakopadesa* this exegesis occurs in a different section.

Although here the DZDL comments only very briefly on the stanza, its interpretation is consistent with that of the Pāli treatise: indeed, also the latter's gloss implies that all the Truths are, explicitly or implicitly, referred to by this well-known stanza. Actually, the *Petakopadesa* is more specific than the DZDL, as it points out at a definite feature of the stanza as representing *magga*, while in the Chinese source the reason for the "immanence", so to speak, of the Path is simply stated in rather general terms<sup>42</sup>.

### 2.1.5

The second method mentioned by the DZDL (T 1509 p. 192b 23 – c 7; tr. Lamotte 1949, pp. 1076-1077) is that "by antidote" 對治門<sup>43</sup>. This means that the mention of a certain negative category involves an implicit reference to the opposite remedy. For instance, when the Buddha only speaks of the *viparyāsa*, also the corresponding antidote, i.e. the category of *smṛtyupasthāna*, is hereby referred to: when the medicine is mentioned, also the relevant type of disease can be inferred, and vice versa<sup>44</sup>.

---

to Indian juridical tradition: cf. Kane 1993 chapter XV, esp. pp. 388-ff. At p. 499, Kane quotes a text which tries to reject death penalty resorting to various arguments. Significantly, capital punishment is also refuted on the ground that, besides the culprit, it unjustly would also affect his innocent relatives, leaving them without support. On the other hand, collective responsibility, even in the form of the extermination of the whole family for one single member's crime (*zu* 族), was a basic tenet in traditional Chinese criminal law. According to Yang 1988 p. 223 (the only historical study of Chinese law I have been able to consult), the punishment of *zu*, dating back to the pre-imperial dynasties, was amended by the Han emperor Wendi 文帝 (180-157 BC; however cf. *Jin shu* 晉書, *zhi* 志 20, *xingfa* 刑法, ed. Zhonghua shuju, Beijing 1974, vol. 3 p. 934), but resumed shortly after.

<sup>41</sup> Of course, this being one of the most famous passages of the entire Buddhist literature, its quotation does not, as such, imply any affiliation between the two sources.

<sup>42</sup> We must, however, consider that this particular example is defined by the *Petakopadesa* itself (p. 19, 16-17) as *catukkaniddeso sādhāraṇo* ("shared tetrad-demonstration", as Nāṇamoli 1964 § 61 renders it; see also n. 61/2 ad loc.), exactly in the sense that it deals with **all** the four Truths, and not just one (cf. §§ 39-41, i.e. *asādhāraṇa*), two (§§ 49-51) or three (§§ 52-54). Perhaps we should see in the explanation provided by the DZDL – 不相離故, which I have tentatively rendered as "because [here the Truths] are not separated" – a reference, by litotes, to the notion of *sādhāraṇa* (an important term in the *Petakopadesa*: "shared" in Nāṇamoli's translation) underlying this passage (Nāṇamoli 1964 §42). In fact, this expression 不相離 used by Kumārajīva is not too clear. Lamotte (1949 p. 1076) translates: "... car elle [i.e. the *mārgasatya*] n'est pas en contradiction (*virodha*) avec les précédents". However, the obvious fact that the Truths do not contradict each other does not yet account for their implication in this stanza. Moreover, 相離 has normally the sense I have indicated: see HYDCD vol. 7 p. 1164, but also other occurrences in the DZDL (T 1509 p. 194b 24, 194c 24, 471b 15). In the light of the possible Pāli parallel, we might perhaps interpret 不相離故 as: «because [in the particular context of this stanza the four Truths are expounded as] not separated».

<sup>43</sup> On the meaning of 對治 in Chinese Buddhist texts, see Nakamura Hajime's 中村元 *Bukkyōgo daijiten* 佛教語大辭典, Tokyo 1981, p. 908b. Lamotte (1949 p. 1076) translated 對治門 as "Enseignement par opposition (*pratipaksaparyāya*)".

<sup>44</sup> DZDL T 1509 p. 192 b 23-26: 對治門者,如佛但說四顛倒,常顛倒、樂顛倒、我顛倒、淨顛倒,是中雖不說四念處,當知已有四念處義。譬如說藥已知其病,說病則知其藥。

I was not able to detect Pāli parallels to this portion of the DZDL as clear and detailed as in the case of the “Method based on the characteristics” 隨相門. However, if we take a closer look at this “Method”, as is described in the Chinese text, it will appear clear that it has mostly to do, exactly as the preceding one (i.e. the *lakkhaṇa-h.*), with a “Mode of Conveying [a communication]” (see above n. 16). In other words, it is, again, in the sections on *hāras* of *Petakopadesa* and *Netti* that we should seek for parallels.

It is the seventh *hāra*, “Conversion” (*āvatto hāro*, here after *āvatta-h.*)<sup>45</sup>, the one which seems to match relatively better the “Method by antidote”<sup>46</sup>. Notwithstanding considerable differences<sup>47</sup>, the two share a number of significant common features, which can be summarised as follows:

a) Both use the relationship between *vipallāsa* and *satipatṭhāna* as a key example (besides several others)<sup>48</sup>.

b) What is more significant, the structure and function of the two principles, *āvatta-h.* on the one hand and “Method by antidote” on the other, are strikingly similar. Both involve, at a first stage, association between different factors belonging to the same “side” (i.e. negative or positive) and, as a subsequent, distinct passage “conversion” to the opposite side. As the DZDL puts it:

«The four perversions are characterised by misconception: if the four perversions are mentioned, then all fetters are [also] hereby referred to. Why? If the root is mentioned, also all the branches and twigs are implied ... In this way all fetters are included in the triple poison. By which [remedy one can] eliminate it? The Eightfold Path consisting of three classes (*skandha*). If this is mentioned, then one must know that all the thirty-seven categories [i.e. the *bodhipākṣikas*] are also referred to»<sup>49</sup>.

On the other hand, the *āvatta-h.*, as Bond describes it, «... shows how ‘footings’ and ‘characteristics’ can be used first to identify unprofitable root terms or other basic ideas of defilement and then to convert the unprofitable roots to the

<sup>45</sup> *Petakopadesa* pp. 93, 20 – 95, 16, tr. Nāṇamoli 1964 pp. 125-128; *Netti* pp. 40-48, tr. Nāṇamoli 1962 pp. 64-73.

<sup>46</sup> One should perhaps also take into account the ninth category, *Parivattanā-hāra*, “Reversal” (*Petakopadesa* p. 95, 22 – 96, 3; tr. Nāṇamoli 1964 p. 129 § 350). Unfortunately, its exposition, in both the *Petakopadesa* and *Netti*, has remained obscure to me.

<sup>47</sup> It is also difficult to determine whether 對治 can be considered a rendering of *āvatta* (but cf. Mizuno 1997 p. 120 item 7!).

<sup>48</sup> Cf. the passages quoted in n. 44 above, n. 49 below and *Petakopadesa* p. 95, 14-16.

<sup>49</sup> DZDL T 1509 p. 192b 27 – c 6 (tr. Lamotte 1949 pp. 1076-1077): 四倒則是邪相。若說四倒，則已說諸結。所以者何？說其根本，則知枝條皆得。...如是一切結使皆入三毒。以何滅之？三分八正道。若說三分八正道，當知已說一切三十七品。It also is noteworthy that here the three *khandhas* of the Eightfold Path (i.e. *silakkhandha*, *saṃādhikkhandha* and *paññākkhandha*) are introduced as an antidote to the threefold poison. On this characteristic doctrine, expounded also by the *Petakopadesa*, see Mizuno 1997: cf. n. 4 p. 129 and p. 133 (quotation n. 9). To the references provided by Prof. Mizuno (*Petakopadesa* p. 67), I can add *Petakopadesa* p. 115, 9 – 116, 5 (see also Zacchetti, forthcoming). For a partial parallel in the *āvatta-hāra*, see *Netti* p. 44, 1-24 (tr. Nāṇamoli 1962, pp. 68-69, § 243-24).

profitable ones. The four foundations of mindfulness oppose the four perversions»<sup>50</sup>.

c) As Bond's descriptions has made clear, this sort of preliminary "associative function", pivotal in the *āvatta-h.*, is mainly carried out trough the "root terms"<sup>51</sup>. This point is particularly noteworthy, as we find a similar use of the same terms also in the "Method by antidote"<sup>52</sup>.

To sum up, it seems a reasonable working hypothesis that the "Method by antidote" 對治門 is indeed the same thing as the *āvatta-h.*, although it is quite clear that in the DZDL's \**Petaka* it was expounded in different terms.

Unlike the preceding section on the "Method based on the characteristics" (隨相門), no stanza is quoted here. If we consider that such quotations are typical of the *hāra*-section of both Pāli treatises, this inconsistency is unlikely to reflect the original of the \**Petaka* quoted by the DZDL.

Perhaps the exposition of this "Method by antidote" 對治門, unlike the "Method based on the characteristics", was not based directly on the original source, although such a discrepancy between the two descriptions is rather difficult to understand. Abridgement by part of the author of the DZDL could be the easiest explanation, if the section dealing with the 對治門 was not almost as long as that on the 隨相門.

## 2.2

The DZDL contains two other very short passages dealing with the \**Petaka*. They occur in the same chapter of the DZDL (in the second *juan* 卷), and are actually separated only by few lines. On the whole, they add little information on the *Petakopadesa*, and are perhaps more relevant to the textual history of the DZDL than to that of the Pāli treatise.

Unlike the passage we analysed in the previous part (2.1 above), here the \**Petaka* is – significantly – mentioned within an exposition of the different

---

<sup>50</sup> Bond 1996a p. 390; see also Mizuno 1997 p. 120. On the *āvatta-h.* in the *Netti*, see Bond 1996b p. 409. The pattern of "reversion", or "conversion" based on common characteristics can be seen at work also in the *lakkhaṇa-hāra* of the *Netti*: see p. 31, 25-ff. (again on *vipallāsas* and *satipatthānas*).

<sup>51</sup> On this is fundamental category occurring in the two Pāli treatises see Bond 1996a p. 394 and 1996b p. 405, Warder 1999 pp. 303-304.

<sup>52</sup> Among the terms employed by the DZDL to illustrate this "Method", we find, besides the four *viparyāsas* (四顛倒), the threefold poison (三毒, i.e. greed, hatred and delusion), "fifteen kinds of ignorance" (十五種無明) and "fifteen kinds of craving" (十五種愛). These categories constitute, in both the *Petakopadesa* and the *Netti*, the group of the negative "root-terms" (*mūlapadāni*). Moreover, quite significantly, the idea of "root" is also mentioned in this connection by the DZDL (T 1509 p. 192b 27-29: 説其根本 etc., see above, n. 49); cf. Bond 1980 p. 21, on the term *mūla* in the *Netti*'s *āvatta-hāra*. These facts seem to have led Prof. Mizuno (1997 p. 129) to the hypothesis that the 對治門 may refer just to the eighteen root-terms. However, in the DZDL (T 1509 p. 192b 27 – c 5; tr. Lamotte 1949 pp. 1076-1077) all these terms are not explicitly described as making up a group, and, exactly as in the *āvatta-h.*, they are mentioned alongside other negative factors. So, for instance, besides those of ignorance and craving, the DZDL also mentions "fifteen kinds of anger" (十五種瞋), which do not belong to the root-terms. Moreover, I have not been able to find in the two Pāli treatises any parallel to this classification of ignorance and craving into "fifteen kinds".

typologies of *Abhidharma* texts (mainly devoted to the Sarvāstivādin *Abhidharma*).

The first passage reads:

«When the Buddha was alive, Mahākātyāyana, explaining the Buddha's Word, composed the \**Petaka* [\**Pile* in the language of Qin<sup>53</sup> is “box, container”]; up to the present it circulates in South India»<sup>54</sup>.

There is little to say on this passage. The portion I have quoted in brackets, which is printed in smaller size in the Chinese text, is clearly a gloss inserted into the DZDL during its translation<sup>55</sup>.

The following statement (“up to the present ... South India”, printed in full size), which is very significant for the history of the \**Petaka*, seems to belong to the original of the DZDL, if we are to trust the ancient editions of the Canon; however, in my opinion this is open to doubt<sup>56</sup>. Actually, in his *Histoire* (1958 pp. 207-208) Lamotte ascribes this whole passage to Kumārajīva.

The next passage is more problematic and more interesting at the same time. It comes at the end of an enumeration of three<sup>57</sup> types of *Abhidharma*; as given by the Korean edition<sup>58</sup> (and subsequently in the *Taishō*), it reads:

«... The third is the \**Petaka*: in its abridged form it consists of 320.000 'words'. The \**Petaka* compares in detail all topics, [so that] they accord with each other by category; it is not *Abhidharma*»<sup>59</sup>.

<sup>53</sup> 秦言: i.e. in Chinese. The Later Qin 後秦 dynasty (384-417 AD) was ruling over North China during Kumārajīva's activity at Chang'an.

<sup>54</sup> T 1509 p. 70a 20-22: 摩訶迦旃延, 佛在時, 解佛語作\*毘勒 (\*毘勒, 秦言籃藏), 乃至今行於南天竺 (tr. Lamotte 1944 p. 113, Przyłuski 1926 p. 73).

<sup>55</sup> On these glosses in the DZDL see Hikata 1958 pp. LIV-ff.

<sup>56</sup> According to Lamotte's analysis (1970 p. IX-ff.), the DZDL was probably composed at the beginning of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century AD (but cf. de Jong 1971-72, esp. p. 109). Not long before this date, An Shigao translated into Chinese a scripture corresponding to chapter 6 of the *Petakopadesa* (see Zucchetti, forthcoming), a fact which suggests that at least a portion of this treatise was probably still circulating in the northern part of the Buddhist world by the half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD. This would make the statement 乃至今行於南天竺 sound a little out of place in the original text of the DZDL. On the other hand, the earliest evidence of the presence of these treatises in the Theravāda area is provided by Buddhaghosa, 5<sup>th</sup> century AD, who «does quote from the *Netti*, and apparently from the *Petakopadesa*» (Nāṇamoli 1962 p. xiii; see also n. 18 ibid.; cf. Nāṇamoli 1964 pp. 400-401) and was almost a contemporary of Kumārajīva (see von Hinüber 1996 p. 103 § 207: «the brackets for Buddhaghosa's dates are about AD 370 to 450»). For these reasons, it seems to me that the reference to South India in this passage of the DZDL would better fit in with the chronology suggested by Buddhaghosa's quotations, and should therefore be ascribed to Kumārajīva (see also Wogihara 1911, rep. p. 211; for a possibly similar interpolation, cf. above n. 40). This is not without relevance: if these are Kumārajīva's words, the date of this precious piece of historical evidence cannot be much earlier than the beginning of the 5<sup>th</sup> century AD. It is also to be observed that in the preceding line (T 1509 p. 70a 20) there occurs a somewhat similar statement on the *Śāriputrābidharma* (“up to the present is named *Śāriputrābidharma*”).

<sup>57</sup> The first two are, according to Lamotte's translation (Lamotte 1944 p. 114), “le Corps et le Sens de l'Abhidharma” (一者阿毘曇身及義) and “[l'Abhidharma] en six parties” (二者六分); the latter is interpreted as \**śatpādābhidharma* (Lamotte 1944 n. 1 p. 111), i.e. the *Jiānaprasthāna* and its six treatises. The fact that the \**Petaka* is mentioned in this context poses a number of additional issues as to the history of this text; cf. part 3.2 below.

<sup>58</sup> Reproduced in the *Zhonghua Dazangjing*, vol. 25 p. 133b 2-4.

However, all other editions have a completely different reading:

«... The third is the \**Petaka*: in its abridged form it consists of 320.000 'words'. This is the *Abhidharma*»<sup>60</sup>.

If we consider the overall context in which this passage occurs, three facts will appear quite clear:

- The original reading (i.e. that occurring in the text on which Kumārajīva based his translation) must be the second, that attested in all the editions apart from the Korean<sup>61</sup>. Apart from stemmatic considerations, only this reading is consistent with the preceding phrase (T 1509 p. 70b 7-8), where the *Abhidharma* is clearly introduced as the topic of the following text, including the passage on the \**Petaka*<sup>62</sup>.

- Therefore, the author of this passage, which describes the \**Petaka* as a form of *Abhidharma*, cannot be the same person who wrote the section on the three Teachings on the *Dharma* in *juan* 卷 18 (see part 2.1 above)<sup>63</sup>: in fact, in that passage the \**Petaka* is clearly opposed to the *Abhidharma* as a distinct genre<sup>64</sup>.

- Then how would one explain the phrase "The \**Petaka* compares in detail all topics etc." occurring in the Korean edition? Lamotte (1944 p. 114), though basing his *Traité* on the *Taishō*, did not translate this passage, nor did he even mention it in a footnote, merely leaving ellipses.

But this is not just a scribal mistake: although this phrase is a sort of stereotyped formula<sup>65</sup>, it gives a sketchy but non incorrect description<sup>66</sup> of a text otherwise

<sup>59</sup> T 1509 p. 70b 9-12: ... 三者\*毘勒, 略說三十二萬言。\*毘勒廣比諸事, 以類相從。非阿毘曇。

<sup>60</sup> See T 1509 p. 70 n. 30 and *Zhonghua Dazangjing*, vol. 25 p. 144a 2-4; instead of \*毘勒廣比諸事 etc. (see the preceding note) as in the Korean Edition, all the other editions simply have: 是 [石:名] 為阿毘曇. Unfortunately, the portion of the Jin 金 Edition containing this passage is not available.

<sup>61</sup> Both Mizuno (1997 p. 128) and Yinshun (1990 p. 42) refer to this passage as given in the *Taishō*, while Przyluski (1926 p. 75 n. 2) followed the other reading.

<sup>62</sup> Note that if we choose this reading, the phrase "This is the *Abhidharma*" is probably to be referred to all the three types of text mentioned (see above n. 57), not just to the \**Petaka*.

<sup>63</sup> Lamotte (1970 n. 2 p. LV) observed: «On pourrait se demander si l'*Upadeśa* [i.e. the DZDL], comme la *Mahāvibhāṣā*, qu'il combat, n'est pas une œuvre collective. C'est une question à laquelle je ne suis pas en mesure de répondre». This is not the place to discuss such an intricate issue as the authorship of the DZDL (on this topic see also Yinshun 1990): one cannot help sharing the great Belgian scholar's cautious approach. But his suggestion is well worth reconsidering. In his fundamental analysis of the DZDL, Hikata (1958 pp. LIII-LIV) detected three distinct layers in this text: passages more or less clearly by Kumārajīva, passages unquestionably by Nāgārjuna (whom he considered the author of main nucleus of the DZDL) and passages «better be regarded as Nāgārjuna's, as has been traditionally held». In other words, only two persons, Kumārajīva and Nāgārjuna, were ultimately taken into account by Hikata (although a passage at p. LXXIII seems to leave room for other possibilities). I cannot discuss here the overall soundness of Hikata's argument; but it seems to me that his hypothesis could hardly account for an inconsistency such as the one I have pointed out here.

<sup>64</sup> We can note another inconsistency, probably less significant: the two passages give a slightly different number of *akṣaras* for the abridged \**Petaka* (cf. above n. 10). It is also noteworthy that one stanza quoted in *juan* 18 occurs elsewhere in the DZDL with a rather different reading: cf. T 1509 p. 192b 19-20 and p. 136c 4-5.

<sup>65</sup> Similar expressions occur in many Chinese Buddhist texts: see for instance Jizang's *Fahua yishu* 法華義疏 T 1721 p. 554a 28, 554c 9 etc.; I am grateful to Prof. Kanno for these references.

almost unknown to Chinese Buddhists (cf. above n. 4). As we have seen, the original reading of the DZDL (“this is the *Abhidharma*”) contradicts the description of the \**Petaka* occurring in *juan* 18. Thus we could interpret the gloss “The \**Petaka* compares ... It is not *Abhidharma*” as an attempt to account for an inconsistency in the text of the DZDL.

Therefore, the author of this gloss must have been an early commentator of the DZDL, or, perhaps, Kumārajīva himself, who used to comment upon the texts during the translation work<sup>67</sup>, although it is difficult to explain why this gloss has been preserved only in the Korean Canon. Perhaps, in a future critical edition of the DZDL, it should not be discharged, but printed in smaller size after the phrase: “this is the *Abhidharma*”.

### 3 Conclusions

#### 3.1

In part 2.1 above I have tried to demonstrate that the \**Petaka* dealt with by the DZDL is indeed related to the Pāli *Petakopadesa*.

Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that the two texts were different<sup>68</sup>. Inconsistency between the description given by the DZDL and the *Petakopadesa* does not, alone, suffice to demonstrate this statement: inaccuracy and abridgement on the part of the author of this portion of the DZDL in quoting from the \**Petaka* might have overshadowed the affinity between the two sources. But the correspondence between this \**Petaka* and the *Netti* (see above part 2.1.3) positively corroborates my assumption.

Also the form of the quotations used to exemplify the “Method based on the characteristics” 隨相門, or *lakkhaṇa-h.*, is noteworthy: in two out of three examples (see above 2.1.2 and 2.1.4), a stanza is at first quoted in full, and then commented on. This comes close to the *hāra*-section of the *Netti* where, unlike the corresponding portion of the *Petakopadesa*, complete stanzas (and even longer passages) are generally quoted<sup>69</sup>. But, on the other hand, from the viewpoint of content, those two examples (i.e. 2.1.2 and 2.1.4) have parallels in the *Petakopadesa* and not in the *Netti*.

In short: the testimony provided by the main “*Petaka* passage”, short and fragmentary as it is, suggests that this \**Petaka* had a *hāra*-section which was – as far as the *lakkhaṇa-h.* is concerned (the “Method by antidote” 對治門 is, as we

<sup>66</sup> After all, establishing connections between different doctrinal topics, and accounting for (apparent) doctrinal inconsistencies is indeed a typical feature of the method expounded by the *Petakopadesa* and the *Netti*. It is one of the main concerns of this tradition to show how various Canonical passages, no matter how different in their wording, agree as to the basic doctrinal tenets: in other words, 以類相從. On this passage of the DZDL, see the remarks by Yinshun 1990 p. 42.

<sup>67</sup> See Lamotte 1970 p. XLIX. For other possible instances of Kumārajīva’s glosses transmitted in the main text (and not in smaller size), see above n. 40 and 56.

<sup>68</sup> As we have seen (n. 10 above), we cannot exclude that this \**Petaka* was larger than both the *Petakopadesa* and the *Netti*.

<sup>69</sup> Actually, this formal discrepancy is not limited to the exposition of *hāras*. As Nāṇamoli (1964 p. xxv) observes in general terms, «Its [i.e. of the *Petakopadesa*] way of presenting quotations is often disagreeably abbreviated, and lacking the *Netti*’s precision».

have seen in part 2.1.5, too problematic to allow us to draw conclusions) – similar in part to the *Petakopadesa* and in part (especially, but not only, in the form of quotations) to the *Netti*<sup>70</sup>.

In his recent book on Pāli literature, Prof. von Hinüber (1996 p. 82 § 171) has also drawn attention to the “*Petaka* passages” in the DZDL: «A text ascribed to Mahākātyāyana called Pi-lê in Chinese, corresponding to ‘*Petaka*’, is mentioned by Kumārajīva (5<sup>th</sup> century) as being used in South India in his translation of Nāgārjuna’s *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra*. This could refer to *Pet[akopadesa]*, if there were not quotations from a ‘*Petaka*’ in Pāli literature, which cannot be traced to *Pet[akopadesa]*. Thus it is not impossible that there was even a third text similar to *Pet[akopadesa]* and *Nett[ippakarana]*».

Indeed, if the argument I have discussed above is not completely wrong, in the DZDL we find other trace of such a “third text”. Whether this \**Petaka* is in turn the one quoted by Pāli sources, is of course, a mere speculation. But if we ascribe the phrase “up to the present it circulates in South India” to Kumārajīva (see above n. 56), even this identification becomes more plausible, though, of course, still entirely hypothetical.

We can also look at the argument discussed above from another perspective: in the discussion of the *lakkhaṇa-h.* the *Netti* makes use of an example which is not in the *Petakopadesa* but is in part paralleled by the \**Petaka* quoted in the DZDL. This fact, in turn, corroborates the hypothesis that the *Netti* is not to be considered a mere direct revision of the *Petakopadesa* (as Nāṇamoli thought)<sup>71</sup>. The history of these treatises must have been a bit more complex.

In this respect, the passage on the Four Truths (part 2.1.4 above) is rather telling: the same stanza and a similar exegesis belong, in the \**Petaka* and in the *Petakopadesa*, to two different sections<sup>72</sup>. This is a pattern of correspondence also met with in comparing *Petakopadesa* and *Netti* (see Nāṇamoli 1962 pp. xvii-ff.; cf. also above n. 23). This fact suggests that all these treatises independently adopted some material (quotations, exegetical methods, glosses etc.) from a (possibly fairly old) common tradition in which it was not yet systematically organised (see also n. 71).

Incidentally, it is also remarkable that, unlike the *Petakopadesa*, the DZDL is very explicit in ascribing the authorship of the \**Petaka* in its present shape only indirectly to Mahākātyāyana (see n. 11 above; cf. von Hinüber 1996 p. 82 § 170).

### 3.2

In the most important passage analysed above (part 2.1), the \**Petaka* was clearly considered to be not simply a text belonging to a certain school, but rather a genre, a particular method and a textual tradition comparable to the *Abhidharma* as a whole: i.e., arguably, a scriptural typology not confined to a

<sup>70</sup> On the discrepancies between the chapters on *hāras* of the two Pāli books see Nāṇamoli 1962 p. xvii.

<sup>71</sup> See again von Hinüber 1996 p. 81 § 168 and 169: «... Perhaps Nett and Pet are not directly dependent on each other, but simply dealing with the same material derived from a common source used for the same purpose».

<sup>72</sup> Cf. also the treatment of the first quotation analysed above (2.1.2) in the various sources, which presents a partially similar situation: see n. 21 and 23.

single sectarian tradition<sup>73</sup>. A genre, we may add in the light of the preceding analysis, probably represented by a number of scriptures.

Whether and to what extent the DZDL's description reflects the actual history of this *Petaka* is, of course, questionable. But in connection to this issue, it may prove fruitful to carry out a systematic comparison between the relevant Pāli sources and Vasubandhu's *Vyākhyāyukti* ("Principles of Exegesis"), recently dealt with by Peter Skilling in a very rich and stimulating article (2000)<sup>74</sup>.

As Skilling describes it, the *Vyākhyāyukti*, which is preserved only in Tibetan, seems to be concerned in the same methodological issue which ultimately produced the two Pāli treatises attributed to Mahākaccāna<sup>75</sup>. The role it played in Indian and Tibetan traditions<sup>76</sup> also parallels the influence of *Petakopadesa* and *Netti* on Theravādin exegetical literature.

Skilling observes that «As a manual of exegesis, the *Vyākhyāyukti* may be compared with the Pāli *Nettipakarana* of the pre-Buddhaghosa Theravādin tradition», concluding provisionally that, apart from few details, he has «not noticed any striking correspondence between the two texts (but a thorough study remains to be made)».

Indeed, if we consider that very likely in an early period the circulation of the *Petakopadesa* was not confined to the Theravāda<sup>77</sup>, it would be also important to extend to it the comparison with Vasubandhu's *Vyākhyāyukti*.

Did a "Petaka tradition" exist in the sense apparently suggested by the DZDL<sup>78</sup>? Only a careful comparison of the methods, quotations from canonical sources and technical terms employed by all these treatises will be enable us to draw some conclusions on this important problem.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. also Mizuno 1997 p. 134; Yinshun 1990 p. 42; Hirakawa 1990, pp. 130-131. The phrase which concludes the whole section on the three types of Teaching – itself a very peculiar book within the book, an interesting short monograph on *prajñā* – is particularly intriguing (T 1509 p. 194a 26 – b 1): «The person who does not attain the method of the *Prajñāpāramitā*, entering into the Teaching of *Abhidharma* will fall into [the wrong view of] existence; entering into the Teaching of Emptiness will fall into [the wrong view of] non-existence; entering into the Teaching of \**Petaka* will fall into [the wrong view of] existence and non-existence».

<sup>74</sup> Recently Lee Jong-cheol 李鐘徹 has published two works on this text: *The Tibetan Text of the Vyākhyāyukti of Vasubandhu*, The Sankibo Press, Tokyo 2001; 世観思想の研究 – 『釋軌論』を中心として (A Study of Vasubandhu – with special reference to the *Vyākhyāyukti*), The Sankibo Press, Tokyo 2001.

<sup>75</sup> As the *Vyākhyāyukti*'s *incipit* states (Skilling 2000 p. 317), this treatise «has been composed for the benefit of "those who wish to explain the sūtras"». Indeed, one might borrow these very same words to describe the *Petakopadesa*!

<sup>76</sup> See Skilling 2000 p. 297 and pp. 332-334.

<sup>77</sup> Some features of the *Petakopadesa* and the *Netti* suggest a northern origin: see Norman 1983 p. 110, Kanda 1991 p. 40; cf. above n. 56.

<sup>78</sup> As well as by some modern scholars: Hirakawa 1990 p. 130; Warder (1999 p. 213; 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1980 p. 220) mentions a source concerning a *Petaka* belonging to the Mahiśāsaka School. Unfortunately, I was not able to check this very interesting information. See also Id. 1999 p. 216: «... the Prajñaptivāda and possibly the Mahāsaṃgha group in general included it [viz. the *Petakopadesa*?] in their *Abhidharma*». If correct, this would be a piece of information of the greatest relevance to our topic, but, regrettably, no evidence is provided at this point by Warder.

#### 4. Appendix: *Kunle / Pile*

As I have briefly noted above (n. 6), the textual tradition of the DZDL's *\*Petaka* passages is remarkably consistent in giving the title of the treatise as **Kun-le** 蠕勒: see T 1509 p. 70 a-b; p. 192 b-c (no variant recorded by the *Taishō*'s apparatus).

Apparently, of the three passages only that in *juan* 18 has been preserved in the Jin 金 Edition (12<sup>th</sup> century): see *Zhonghua Dazangjing* 中華大藏經 (Beijing 1984-1988) vol. 25 p. 423 a-c. Here the Jin text has *kunle* 昆勒 which, as a phonetic transcription, appears equivalent to 蠕勒.

The reading 蠕勒 occurs also in one manuscript from Dunhuang (北 7261, see *Dunhuang Baozang* 敦煌寶藏 vol. 105 p. 238)<sup>79</sup>, to my knowledge the only surviving fragment relevant to the our topic<sup>80</sup>.

That nevertheless we should still read *\*Pile*, i.e., arguably, *\*Petaka*, was demonstrated in detail – and very convincingly, in my opinion – by Wogihara Unrai long time ago (1911, repr. pp. 206-209), although, to be sure, the right conjecture had already been suggested by the Later Jin 後晉 lexicographer Kehong 可洪 in his remarkable glossary<sup>81</sup>.

This of *kunle* is a well-known problem, at least to East Asian scholars, yet there remain a few obscure points. The fact that not only all the direct witnesses of the DZDL, as expounded above, but even the commentaries quoting from the DZDL are generally consistent in having the error *kunle* (see above n. 8) is particularly striking.

However, we may formulate an hypothesis. As Wogihara did not fail to observe (1911, rep. p. 206), the wrong reading *kunle* is recorded, by means of a *fanqie* 反切 gloss, in Huilin's 慧琳 early 9<sup>th</sup> century glossary *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義<sup>82</sup>.

We know that Huilin based this section of his glossary on the 7<sup>th</sup> century homonymous glossary by Xuanying 玄應 (not printed independently in the *Taishō*). The question whether the gloss under issue occurred already in the latter text is difficult to answer, because Xuanying's glossary has in fact been transmitted

<sup>79</sup> At the beginning of the relevant passage, where the three "Teachings" are introduced (cf. part 2.1 above) the manuscript reads 一者蠕勒箇門 ("The first is the *Kunle*-box"); quite clearly, this is not a variant: the scribe simply took up the gloss inserted in the previous mention of the *Petaka*, that occurring in the second *juan* (see part 2.2 above). We must also observe that at the very beginning of the *Petaka* passage, the manuscript lacks eighteen characters corresponding to the phrase which introduce the two Methods (i.e. T 1509 p. 192b 6-7: 其中有...隨相門者; see above part 2.1). As in this manuscript each line has seventeen characters, we can conclude that here the scribe has merely skipped one line.

<sup>80</sup> On the very intricate manuscript tradition of the DZDL, now see Ito Mieko's 伊藤美重子 detailed study: "Tonkō bon *Daichidoron* no seiri" 敦煌本『大智度論』の整理, in Kesagawa 1996, pp. 339-409; the synoptic table provided at pp. 395-409 is most useful. The manuscript containing the main "Petaka" passage" cannot be dated with certainty; however, the group to which it belongs, according to Ito's classification of the DZDL manuscripts, is made up by rather ancient copies (see Ito's study, in Kesagawa 1996, pp. 351-352).

<sup>81</sup> *Xinji zangjing yinyi sui han lu* 新集藏經音義隨函錄 (completed in 940 AD; see Chen 1992, pp. 1023-1027): see the Korean edition of the Canon, 高麗大藏經 vol. 34 p. 985a, also quoted by Wogihara 1911, rep. p. 207.

<sup>82</sup> T 2128 p. 610b 18: 古魂反。此譯云箇藏也. Note that the *Taishō* wrongly has 塊 instead of 魂; but cf. the Korean edition vol. 42 p. 964a, which gives the correct reading.

in two rather different recensions<sup>83</sup>: one preserved by the Korean and Jin editions, and the other by a group of closely connected editions carved during the Song, Yuan and Ming dynasties<sup>84</sup>. Now, the gloss on *kunle* occurs only in the second recension (see *Zhonghua Dazangjing* vol. 57 p. 220c 10 and cf. vol. 56 p. 951b), and thus we cannot exclude that its occurrence is due to conflation with Huilin's glossary.

Both Xuanying and Huilin had took part in the translation teams of their period, and at least the latter is credited by biographical sources with a good command of Sanskrit<sup>85</sup>: thus it is hard to imagine which Indic word, if any, he had in mind when he used the DZDL's gloss (籃藏, "box, container") to explain the wrong reading *kunle*<sup>86</sup>.

At all events, the unequivocal acceptance of the wrong reading in these glossaries – particularly authoritative as to difficult or rare terms – is likely to have been the main reason for its widespread preservation in the Canon.

<sup>83</sup> See the remarks in the *Zhonghua Dazangjing*'s apparatus, vol. 56 p. 827b, and by Zhou Fagao 周法高 in the preface (pp. 1-2) to his *Xuanying yiqiejing yinyi* 玄應一切經音義, Zhongyang yanjiuyuan lishiyuan yanjiusuo 中央研究院歷史語言研究所 (47), Taipei 1962.

<sup>84</sup> The editors of the *Zhonghua Dazangjing* have wisely decided to print the two recensions of Xuanying's glossary separately (vols. 56-57). As to this second recension (vol. 57), they have reproduced the Yongle Nanzang 永樂南藏 (15<sup>th</sup> century) as main text, collated with the Qisha 磚砂 (13-14<sup>th</sup> century), Puning 普寧 (end of the 13<sup>th</sup> century) and Jingshan 徑山 (16-17<sup>th</sup> century) editions. Unfortunately the Siqu 思溪 (12<sup>th</sup> century) edition(s) is not represented in this collation; it might have been the hyparchetype of this recension (cf. Wogihara 1911, rep. p. 206: he quotes the Song 宋 edition as having the *kunle* gloss!). These witnesses belong to the same branch of the tradition: therefore their agreement is of little stemmatic importance.

<sup>85</sup> Huilin was a "bon sanskritiste" according to Demiéville (*Sources Chinoises*, p. 457 § 2156, repr. in Demiéville 1973; cf. Chen 1992 p. 1012); see also his short biography in the *Song gao seng zhuan* 宋高僧傳 T 2061, especially p. 738a 24-25.

<sup>86</sup> To my knowledge, Ven. Yinshun (1990 p. 42) is the only modern scholar who took into account, besides the above mentioned emendation, also the possibility of following the *textus receptus*: he proposed, as a possible original of *kunle*, *\*karapda*. However, apart from other considerations, the presence of a final *-k* in the medieval pronunciation of the character 勒 (EMC *lək* etc.: see Pulleyblank 1991 p. 184; cf. Coblin 1994 p. 413, s.v. 0984) makes this reconstruction rather questionable. I must thank Prof. Karashima for a very fruitful discussion of this issue. Yinshun 1989 (which I could access only through internet: [hku.hk/buddhist/yinshun/40/yinshun40-00.html](http://hku.hk/buddhist/yinshun/40/yinshun40-00.html)) discusses the issue in greater details, and decidedly takes side for *kunle* as the correct reading: see pp. 16-18. Here Yinshun challenges Wogihara's hypothesis mainly on the ground that in Kumārajīva's transcriptions an initial *ś* would stay for *vī* and not for *pi* (1989 p. 17); but cf. Coblin 1994 p. 217, entry 0302 (especially s.v. *Km*, i.e. Kumārajīva). In this study Yinshun concludes (1989 p. 18), seemingly only on the basis of the very brief reference to Mahākātyāyana's activity in compiling the *Abhidharma* contained in the *Zhuanji sanzang ji zazang zhuan* 摹集三藏及雜藏傳 T 2026 (p. 3c 12-; cf. Lamotte 1958 p. 207 and 146), that the text described by the DZDL is a fundamental treatise of the Mahāsaṃghika tradition (cf. n. 78 above) unrelated to the *Petakopadesa*.

## Bibliography

### 1. Main primary sources and abbreviations

DZDL: *Da zhidu lun* 大智度論 T 1509

Netti: Hardy, E. (ed.) *The Netti-pakaraṇa with Extracts from Dhammapāla's Commentary*, Pali Text Society, London 1902 (repr. 1961)

*Petakopadesa*: Barua, Arabinda (ed.), *The Petakopadesa*, Pali Text Society (Text Series No. 88), London 1949 (Revised Edition 1982)

### 2. Literature

Bechert, Heinz 1992, "The Writing Down of the Tripitaka in Pāli", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 36 (1992), pp. 45-53

Bond, George D. 1980, "The Netti-Pakaraṇa: A Theravāda Method of Interpretation", in: Somaratna Balasooriya et al. (eds.), *Buddhist Studies in Honour of Walpola Rahula*, Gordon Fraser, London 1980, pp. 16-28

Bond, George D. 1996a, "Petakopadesa", in: Potter, Karl H. et al. (eds.) *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies – vol. VII: Abhidharma Buddhism to 150 A.D.*, Motilal Banarsi Dass, Delhi 1996, pp. 381-401

Bond, George D. 1996b, "Nettippakaraṇa", in: Potter, Karl H. et al. (eds.) *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies – vol. VII: Abhidharma Buddhism to 150 A.D.*, Motilal Banarsi Dass, Delhi 1996, pp. 403-416

Boucher, Daniel 2000, "On Hu and Fan Again: the transmission of 'Barbarian' Manuscript to China", in: *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 23 (1), 2000, pp. 7-28

Chen Shiqiang 陳士強 1992, *Fodian jingjie* 佛典精解, Shanghai guji chubanshe, Shanghai

Coblin, W. South 1994, *A Compendium of Phonetics in Northwest Chinese*, Journal of Chinese Linguistics – Monograph Series Number 7, Berkeley

de Jong, J. W. 1971-72, Review of Lamotte 1970, *Asia Major* vol. XVII, 1971-72, pp. 105-112

Demiéville, Paul 1931-1932, "L'origine des sectes bouddhiques d'après Paramārtha", in *Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques*, 1 (1931-1932), pp. 15-64 (repr. in Demiéville 1973)

Demiéville, Paul 1950, review of E. Lamotte 1949, in: *Journal Asiatique* CCXXXVIII (1950), pp. 375-395

Demiéville, Paul 1973, *Choix d'études bouddhiques*, E. J. Brill, Leiden

HYDCCD: *Hanyu da cidian* 漢語大詞典, 13 vols., Shanghai 1986-1994

Hikata, Ryūshō 1958, *Suvikrāntavikrāmi-pariprēchā-Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra Edited with an Introductory Essay*, Fukuoka

Hirakawa, Akira (tr. by Paul Groner) 1990, *A History of Indian Buddhism - from Sākyamuni to Early Mahāyāna* (English tr. of *Indo-Bukkyōshi*, vol. 1, Tokyo 1974), University of Hawaii press, Asian Studies at Hawaii No. 36, Honolulu

von Hinüber, Oskar 1996, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*, Indian Philology and South Asian Studies 2, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin- New York

Kanda, Takashi 神田隆司 1991, "Pāli Bukkyō zōgai bunken no ichi kōsatsu – Petakopadesa ni tsuite" ハ°—リ 佛教藏外文献の一考察 — Petakopadesa について, *Bukkyō ronsō* 佛教論叢, n. 35, September 1991, pp. 32-41

Kane, Pandurang Vaman 1993 (3<sup>rd</sup> edition; 1946<sup>1</sup>), *History of Dharmasāstra*, vol. 3, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona

Kegasawa, Yasunori 氣賀澤保規 (ed.) 1996, *Chūgoku Bukkyō sekkyō no kenkyū* 中國佛教石經の研究, Kyōto daigaku gakujutsu shuppankai, Kyoto

Lamotte, Étienne 1944, *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitāsāstra)*, Tome I, Louvain

Lamotte, Étienne 1949, *Le traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nagarjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitāsāstra)*, Tome II, Louvain

Lamotte, Étienne 1958, *Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien, des origines à l'ère Śaka*, Louvain (English translation by Sara Webb-Boin, supervised by Jean Dantinne: *History of Indian Buddhism from the origins to the Śaka Era*, Louvain 1988)

Lamotte, Étienne 1970, *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra)*, Tome III, Louvain

Lamotte, Étienne 1980, *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra)*, Tome V, Louvain

Lévi, Sylvain 1915, "La récitation primitive des textes bouddhiques", *Journal Asiatique* 1915, I, pp. 401-447

Mizuno, Kogen 水野弘元 1954, "The Pali Texts Translated into Chinese", *Proceedings of the Okurayama Research Institute* 大倉山學院紀要, Volume 1 (December 1954), pp. 14-26

Mizuno, Kogen 水野弘元 1997, *Pāli ronjo kenkyū パリロントウ* (論書研究 - Mizuno Kogen chosaku senshū) vol. 3 水野弘元著作選集 第三卷, Tokyo ("Petakopadesa ni tsuite について", pp. 119-148, is the modified version of an article originally published in the *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究, n. 7, 2, 1959, pp. 56-68)

Nakamura, Hajime 1980, *Indian Buddhism - A Survey with Bibliographical Notes*, Kansai University of Foreign Studies, Hirakata City

Ñāṇamoli, Bhikkhu 1962 (tr.), *The Guide (Netti-ppakaraṇam)*, Pali Text Society (Translation Series No. 35), London

Ñāṇamoli, Bhikkhu 1964 (tr.), *The Piṭaka-Disclosure (Petakopadesa)*, Pali Text Society (Translation Series No. 35), London

Norman, K. R. 1983, *Pāli Literature (A History of Indian Literature*, edited by Jan Gonda, vol. VII.2), Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden

Przyluski, Jean 1926, *Le Concile de Rājagṛha - Introduction à l'histoire des Canons et des sectes bouddhiques*, Paris

Pulleyblank, Edwin G. 1991, *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*, UBC Press, Vancouver

Ramanan, K. Venkata 1966, *Nāgārjuna's Philosophy as Presented in the Mahā-Prajñāpāramitā-Śāstra*, Tuttle, Rutland and Tokyo

Saigusa, Mitsuyoshi 1969, *Studien zum Mahāprajñāpāramitā(upadeśa)śāstra*, Tokyo

Satō, Ryōjun 佐藤良純 1966, "Netti. ni okeru sō に於ける相", *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 vol. 14, 2 (1966), pp. 205-208

Skilling, Peter 2000, "Vasubandhu and the *Vyākhyāyukti* Literature", *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 23 (2), 2000, pp. 297-350

Warder, A. K. 1999<sup>3</sup> (first ed. 1970), *Indian Buddhism*, Motilal Banarsi Dass, Delhi

Wogihara, Unrai 萩原雲來 1911, "U-kū-tō no shimon ni tsuite 有空等の四門に就て", originally published in *Shyūkyō kai* 宗教界 vol. 7 n. 10, 1911 (repr. in *Wogihara Unrai bunshyu* 萩原雲來文集, Tokyo 1972; this is the edition referred to in the present article)

Yang, Hegao 楊鶴皋 (chief ed.) 1988, *Zhongguo falü sixiang shi* 中國法律思想史, Beijing daxue chubanshe, Beijing

Yingshun 印順 1989, *Shuoyiqieyoubu wezhu de lunshu yu lunshi zhi yanjiu* 說一切有部爲主的論書與論師之研究, Zhengwen chubanshe, Taibei

Yinshun 印順 1990, "«Da zhidu lun» zhi zuozhe ji qi fanyi" 《大智度論》之作者及其翻譯, in: *Dongfang zongjiao yanjiu* 東方宗教研究 2, 1990 (10), pp. 9-70

Zacchetti, Stefano (forthcoming), "An Early Chinese Translation corresponding to Chapter 6 of the *Petakopadesa* - An Shigao's *Yin chi ru jing* T 603 and its Indian Original: A Preliminary Survey", forthcoming in the *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, n. 65 (1), 2002